DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 472 EC 130 124

AUTHOR Barrick, Stanley W.; And Others
TITLE Report on the District-Wide Interviews in Special Education: Teacher Satisfaction, Student Integration, and Student Satisfaction, Spring 1978.
INSTITUTION San Juan Unified School District, Carmichael, Calif.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 75p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities: Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Mainstreaming; Peer Acceptance; Questionnaires; *Student Attitudes; Student Placement; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Over 200 interviews were conducted with students and teachers at the elementary, intermediate, and high school levels to investigate satisfaction with the San Juan School District (California) Master Plan, suggestions for the improvement of services, and satisfaction with the integration of the special education students. Teachers were generally satisfied with the Master Plan and saw improvements in parental involvement, the individualized teaching style, and student self concepts. Factors responsible for unsuccessful cases were reported as class behavior problems, motivation problems, and attendance problems. Integration of the learning development class (LDC) was less successful than the integration of the resource specialist class (RSP) student. Among findings related to integration were the following: the LDC student was usually integrated for physical education; at nearly all levels more RSP students than LDC students said they had friends in the regular classes; approximately half of the LDC students said most of their friends were in the LDC room; the use of labels appeared to be at a minimum; the stigma that the students attached to special education appeared to be at a minimum, except for the intermediate LDC student; the special education students generally agreed that they were being helped; and the RSP and high school LDC students were satisfied with their placement, but nearly half of the elementary LDC students and nearly three fourths of the intermediate LDC students did not agree with their placement. Sample questionnaires are appended. (Author/SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED192472

SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION DEPARTMENT

REPORT ON THE DISTRICT-WIDE INTERVIEWS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION: TEACHER SATISFACTION, STUDENT INTEGRATION, AND STUDENT SATISFACTION

SPRING 1978

PREPARED BY:

Stanley W. Barrick
Administrative Leadership Trainee

CONTRIBUTORS:

Nancy Enell, Evaluation Specialist

Cathy Walker, Speech Therapist

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stanley W. Barrick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 130124

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS.....1
SUMMARY OF THE REPORT.....11
INTRODUCTION.....1
THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEWS.....1
THE SAMPLE.....2
DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW PROCESS.....3
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....3
THE LEARNING DEVELOPMENT CLASS TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE ELEMENTARY.....4
THE RESOURCE TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE ELEMENTARY.....8
THE REGULAR TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE ELEMENTARY.....12
A FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE CASE STUDIES AT THE ELEMENTARY...14
THE STRONG/WEAK POINTS OF THE SPECIAL ED PROGRAM AT THE ELEMENTARY.....15
THE ELEMENTARY STUDENT INTERVIEWS.....18
CONCLUSIONS FOR THE ELEMENTARY.....24

THE LEARNING DEVELOPMENT CLASS TEACHER AT THE INTERMEDIATE.....28
THE INTERMEDIATE RESOURCE TEACHER INTERVIEWS.....29
THE REGULAR TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE INTERMEDIATE.....30
A FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE CASE STUDIES AT THE INTERMEDIATE.....31
THE INTERMEDIATE STUDENT INTERVIEWS.....32
CONCLUSIONS FOR THE INTERMEDIATE.....36

THE LEARNING DEVELOPMENT CLASS TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE HIGH SCHOOL.....39
THE RESOURCE TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE HIGH SCHOOL.....41
THE REGULAR TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE HIGH SCHOOL.....43
A FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL CASE STUDIES.....44
THE STRONG/WEAK POINTS OF THE SPECIAL ED PROGRAM AT THE HIGH SCHOOL.....45
THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT INTERVIEWS.....48
CONCLUSIONS FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL.....52

APPENDIX I: THE 1st QUESTIONNAIRE 54
APPENDIX II: THE 2nd QUESTIONNAIRE 61

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study recommends the following changes. These changes were based on the interviews of 200+ LDC teachers, RSP teachers, regular teachers and students at the various levels.

- Further inservice of the regular teachers regarding the right of the handicapped child to the most appropriate education.

- Inservice of the regular teacher regarding the learning handicapped child. This inservice should involve the characteristics of the LH child, the needs of the LH child, and the teaching techniques which best facilitate the LH student learning and motivation.

- The organizational and clerical duties of the LDC teacher and the RSP teacher should be streamlined. The job role of the RSP teacher should be defined to allow for the coordination of the site special ed program.

- There should be more psychological services provided to the LDC student especially in the area of counseling.

- More curricular materials and equipment should be supplied to the special ed teachers. The curricular materials should be more appropriate to the student needs.

- For integration purposes, the special ed student should be housed in a typical classroom. His placement should be as unobtrusive as possible.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

This paper reported the results of 200+ interviews of students and teachers at the elementary, intermediate and high school levels. The teachers were asked questions regarding their satisfaction with Master Plan. The students were asked questions regarding integration and satisfaction.

Teacher satisfaction

The teachers were generally satisfied with Master Plan. The elementary teachers saw improvements in:

- parental involvement
- opportunity for integration
- additional services available
- improving student self concept
- removing stigma from special ed
- a better teaching approach for the learning handicapped

The intermediate teachers saw improvements in:

- a lowering of the adult/pupil ratio in the classroom
- the individualized teaching style
- the serving of students who were deficient in skills, but who were formerly not served by special ed

The high school teachers saw improvements in:

- integration of handicapped students and delabeling, while allowing for socialization
- an improvement in student self concept
- the teaching method which allowed for a more personalized, one to one contact between teacher and student

The case studies of students were analyzed. The elementary teachers usually cited cases in which they successfully remediated problems in:

- reading
- self concept
- class behavior

The intermediate teachers gave case studies in which they were successful in remediating problems in:

- social skills
- reading skills
- class behavior problems
- math skills

At the high school it was:

- self concept
- social skills
- attendence

The single factor which the elementary teachers considered to be the reason for the unsuccessful case was:

- class behavior problems

The intermediate teachers added:

- motivation problems

The high school teachers added:

- attendence problems

<u>student integration</u>

The integration of the LDC student was less successful than the integration of the RSP student.

- The LDC student was usually integrated for P.E. Many were also integrated for elective classes. At the elementary level, nearly half of the LDC students were not integrated into regular classes.
- At nearly all levels more RSP students than LDC students said they had friends in the regular classes.
- Approximately half of the LDC students said most of their friends were in the LDC room. The RSP student usually said that most of their friends were in the regular class.
- The use of labels appeared to be at a minimum. The special ed student often did not know that he was in a special ed class. The awareness of special education increased with age.
- The stigma that the students attached to special ed appeared to be at a minimum, except for the intermediate LDC student.

student satisfaction

The special ed students generally agreed that they were being helped. They felt they were being helped in reading, math, writing, and language.

- The RSP students were content with their placement.
- The high school LDC students were satisfied with their placement. But, nearly half of the elementary students wished to be in another class and nearly three-fourths of the intermediate LDC students did not agree with their placement.

INTRODUCTION

This study focused on the Learning Development Class and the Resource Specialist Program of the San Juan School District. Other special education classes were reported, but were not the major thrust of this study. The main areas investigated were:

- satisfaction with the Master Plan
- suggestions for the improvement of services
- integration of the special education students

The results of this study were reported in the following manner. The purpose of the study, the study sample, the development of the interview, and the interview process were described. Next, the elementary, intermediate and high school levels were reported in that order. Each level was summarized by type of person interviewed. The major categories of person-type were the Learning Development Class teacher, the Resource Specialist Class teacher, the regular teacher and the students. The other special programs such as the deaf and aphasic programs were then reported. General conclusions and recommendations were also included. And, finally, an appendix containing the interview statements, case studies and questionnaires was included.

THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEWS

The purpose of the interviews emcompasses several aspects:

Foremostly, the interviews were designed to compliment other district evaluations. The interviews could be used to verify conclusions reached by other means such as questionnaires.

Secondly, the interviews gave a more personal dimension to the evaluation process. This was especially relevant when interviewing special ed students. The special ed students have varying problems and ability levels. The interviewer could adapt the questions to fit this student. The questions also could be given orally rather than in a questionnaire. This was desirable since often the special ed students were poor

readers. At the teacher level, interactions could take place with warmth. Empathy could be established as to the common goals of evaluation and instruction. From this, a more probing evaluation could take place.

Thirdly, the interviews were designed to uncover both areas for improvement and areas of excellence. The areas for improvement could be investigated in further studies. The areas of excellence could be used as models for other sites.

THE SAMPLE

The total sample size for the interviews was in excess of 200. The interviews took place on the elementary, intermediate and high school campuses.

The elementary interviews included eight schools: Deterding, Mariemont, Dewey, Whitney, Littlejohn, Fair Oaks, Schweitzer and Cottage. Deterding was used to pilot the interviews. At each school at least the following was sampled: a Learning Development Class (LDC) teacher, a Resource Specialist Program (RSP) teacher, a regular teacher, three RSP students, three LDC students and three regular students. Other special education classes were interviewed as appropriate, such as the aphasic class at Cottage and the deaf program at Dewey. Schweitzer did not have an LDC class, so neither an LDC teacher nor LDC students were included from this school.

Half of the schools were from the east area of the district. The rest were from the west. Approximately one seventh of the elementary schools was sampled. An attempt was made to select a sample of students which was representative.

The intermediate school sample included Salk, Carnegie, Barrett and Churchill. Carnegie was in the east area; the rest were in the west area. Four-ninths of the intermediate schools were sampled. Interviews, likewise, were conducted with respect to the Resource Specialist Program and Learning Development Class. The deaf classes at Barrett were also sampled. Salk was the pilot school for the intermediate schools.

The high school sample included Rio Americano, Mesa Verde, Encina and Mira Loma. Mesa Verde is in the east area; the rest are in the west area of the district. Four-tenths of the high school were sampled. Rio Americano was the pilot school for the high schools.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

The initial contact at each school was the site administrator. The purpose and contact of the interview was described. Beginning at this level, and at each successive level, assurances of anonymity were given to the student. Next, the resource specialist teacher was contacted. He usually was used as the coordinator and scheduler of the interviews. Often the site administrator volunteered to do this task.

For the students, a quiet, empty room was usually found. If such a room was not available, the interview took place in the resource room. The teachers were interviewed either in their home room or the faculty lounge. Care was taken to choose a time and place that was relatively free of interruptions. All of the interviews took place from 7:30 to 3:30 pm on March 28 through May 9, 1978. The elementary and intermediate schools were sampled first, followed by the high schools.

An attempt was made to avoid the common pitfall of the interview method. This pitfall is the introduction of bias and subjectivity by the interviewer. The attempt to eliminate bias was advanced by two facts. The first was the use of two interviewers to conduct the interviews. The second was a conscious effort by the interviewers to explore areas exposed by the questioning, but not to lead to some preconceived notion.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The interview structure was semi-structured. The interview was built around a core of structured questions from which the interviewer branched off. Thusly, accurate and complete information was obtained

Yet, the option to probe for underlying factors was retained. This semi-structured approach was selected due to the complex nature of many factors and relationships in special education. The relationships were often too elusive for a single set of straight-forward questions. Therefore, the interview method seemed to naturally fit special education.

The structured core of interview questions began from student questions formulated the previous spring by Doctoral candidate, Danna Naron. To this core was added the teacher questions. The teacher questions were formulated to answer and explore questions surrounding the district special education goals, the state and federal goals implied in A.B. 1250 and P.L. 94-142.

This core of questions was then piloted in three schools: Deterding (K-6), Salk (7-8) and Rio Americano (9-12). The questions were then re-written in the form of Appendix I. These questions were used for half the elementary and half the intermediate schools. The interviews were, then, reread and revised. This was done not only to improve, but also to add somewhat more of a structure to the interviews. The interviews were changed in the direction in which the previous interviews seemed to consistently take. This interview structure is found in Appendix II.

THE LEARNING DEVELOPMENT CLASS TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE ELEMENTARY

Improvements due to Master Plan

The elementary LDC teachers seemed to be unified in their opinions of the success of the Master Plan. They generally viewed the Master Plan as providing the following improvements:

1. Parental involvement - The use of the EAS and the annual assessment meetings provided for more parental involvement. The improvement of parental communication was seen as result of the mandated EAS and assessment meetings. The parent seemed to be more aware of the student's progress, the educational goals and any change in program.

2. Opportunity for integration - The LDC student now has more of an opportunity to be integrated into the regular classroom. Many of the teachers saw the student conforming to the behavior of their peers. Integration was, therefore, seen as another tool to affect behavior.
3. Additional designated instructional services available - The LDC teachers saw an increase in the designated instruction services which were available for the diagnosis of the LDC student's problems. This increased involvement of many professionals in the diagnosis of the LDC student's problems was seen as an approach of merit.

But, the appropriate use of the professional's time was questioned. For example, a speech and language professional was required to assess an LDC student, even though, it may be obvious that the student's problem did not lie in the speech and language area. This inappropriate use of professional time to diagnose left less time for him to remediate.

Several LDC teachers suggested that more psychological services could be provided, particularly, for the areas of counseling and behavior modification. The teachers who expressed this concern were also the teachers who cited case studies of children who seemed to have severe psychological problems.

the Master Plan concerns

The Master Plan concerns of LDC teachers fell into several categories. These categories of concern were as follows:

1. Funding - The LDC teachers felt that some of the success of the Master Plan would be negated by expenditure reduction. The teachers noted that funds for supplies and curricular materials were reduced for their area by the Master Plan. They also pointed out that the class sizes had increased when the EH and EMR classes were replaced by the Resource Specialist Program and the Learning Development Classes. Fear was ex-

pressed that a further class size increase in the LDC classes would result from any decrease in revenues available. This possibility was viewed with alarm.

2. Flexibility of the program - The possibility of funding cuts was seen as a threat to the flexibility of the LDC class. First, this would reduce the options available for the solution of the student problems by restricting designated instruction services. The reduction of funding would, also possibly, increase the class size which in turn would compound the behavior problems and reduce the flexibility in the classroom instruction.

   The use of criteria for placement was also mentioned as a threat to the flexibility of resources to meet the needs of students. On the other hand, some LDC teachers argued that the use of criteria would solve some of the problems surrounding placement.

3. the acceptance of the LDC student into the regular class - Several elementary LDC teachers noted a reluctance on the part of regular teachers to accept LDC students. This reluctance was attributed to several reasons: These are listed below:
   a. the lack of flexibility in the instructional mode to adapt to the more active student on the part of the regular teacher.
   b. the actual behavior of the LDC student deviated significantly from the norm.
   c. the regular teacher often did not see his function as one which includes serving the LDC student.
   d. the lack of regular teacher expertise in meeting the needs of the LDC student.

Suggestions for improvement

The suggestions for improvement in the LDC program, generally, were suggestions that would alleviate some of the problems associated with the wide ranging problems in the LDC classroom. The class size was cited as contributing to these problems. For this reason, class size

reduction was suggested. The altering of class grouping was also suggested. These particular groupings were mentioned:

- the teaming of two LDC teachers to split the primary and upper elementary students into two classes
- the grouping to obtain a cohesive social structure

It was generally reported that the severity and the number of different problems encountered in the LDC classroom made it difficult to solve all of the problems effectively. The interaction between the severity and the number of problems often made it difficult to deal with behavioral problems.

The successful case studies

After each case study which the teacher considered a success, the teacher was asked to give the reason for the success. The comments fell into the following three major classifications:

1. behavior alteration - the success in behavior was attributed to several things. The use of behavior modification in a consistent fashion was the most cited reason. This was achieved by a high level of adult supervision to reinforce the proper student behavior. Direct and frank discussions with the parents were also found useful.
2. individual attention - the use of individual attention was considered to be a factor in many of the successes. This helped students in the academic areas, since it cut down the time that a student would wait when a problem was encountered. This shorter waiting time reduced frustration. The individual attention also made it possible for the teacher to be warmer and more caring. The establishment of a warm relationship was viewed as essential by some.
3. proper academic materials - most LDC teachers considered the selection of proper academic materials to be another factor for success. These materials should be chosen at, or slightly above, the child's skill level. The presentation of materials must be paced such that it gives the student a lot of success. This success was seen as important to improving the student's self concept.

the unsuccessful case studies

After each case considered unsuccessful, the teacher was also asked to give the reason for not succeeding. The comments on these cases were fewer and fell into a single major category.

misplaced students - the students were usually considered to have such exceptional needs that they were considered misplaced. Most of these problems were judged to be primarily behavioral problems. The comments on each severe behavioral problem were, usually, coupled with a brief discussion on the need for more counseling services.

summary of LDC teacher interviews

In summary, the elementary LDC teacher considered the Master Plan to be a mixed success. The opportunity for integration was applauded, but the task of integration was often problematical. Similarly, the diagnosis of students was also a plus, but the diversion of expert resources from remediation to do this was a problem. Flexibility of placement and categorization of students was seen as an asset, but the main problem was misplaced students. Misplaced students in turn produced the suggestion to fabricate criteria for placement.

THE RESOURCE TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE ELEMENTARY

Improvements due to Master Plan

When asked for the greatest success of Master Plan, the resource teacher answers were more numerous than the LDC teacher answers. The successes were categorized as follows:

1. serving students formerly unserved
   The majority of the resource teachers stated that the greatest success of the Master Plan was the serving of students formerly unserved. These students were the struggling students that the teacher often could not adequately serve due to class size. These were the students that formerly did not fit into the educa-

tionally handicapped, nor the educably mentally retarded classifications. They were often ignored and their needs were not being met. Now they were being well served by the resource room. The resource room was considered a place to which these children can go with their academic problems and feel successful.

2. parental involvement - The resource teachers felt the parent now had the opportunity to take part in the planning of their child's education. This was seen as producing two things of importance; a better understanding between parents and teachers, and a better communication between parents and teachers.

3. improving student self concept - Many of the resource teachers concluded that the resource students feel better about themselves. This was believed to be due to the resource program. This improvement in general attitude was judged to transfer to the regular classroom. The elements which were considered to have caused this heightened self concept were close academic and affective support. Two major student goals seem to be academic remediation and a simultaneous development of a feeling of competence. This feeling of competence was believed to be transferred to other subjects in which the remediated skill was used. The classroom, as a result, was believed to be perceived by the student as a more enjoyable place.

4. removing stigma from special education in general - Many resource teachers felt that the stigma of special education had been reduced. Positive feelings seemed to be coming out of special education as a result of Master Plan. The positive feelings seemed to come from providing a valuable service to more students and teachers.

the Master Plan concerns

The elementary resource teacher's greatest concerns were directed towards the effective and efficient functioning of the site, special education program. One theme which emerged was the proper placement

of students. The concerns were expressed in the following ways:

a. Special education may possibly become a dumping ground for behavior problems. The regular classroom was the proper place to handle behavior problems rather than group the behavior problems together.
b. The misplacement of students into the LDC classes was believed to occur.
c. Care should be taken to assure that students with severe learning disabilities are not placed in the resource specialist program.

Serving the student properly seemed to be the underlying concern for proper placement. In order to meet the extreme needs of the student, he must be placed in a class designed and equipped to meet these special needs. Proper placement was seen as the solution to the extreme behavior problem rather than a class program adaptation.

<u>suggestions for improvement</u>

The things, that seemed to keep the elementary resource teacher from doing as well as they'd like, were their organizational duties. This was almost a unanimous response. The duties cited were:

1. paperwork - That is the individual educational plan, testing, pupil data sheets, monitoring student grades, etc.
2. setting up the SAT meeting and reassessment meetings - The scheduling of teachers, administrators and parents; the disbursing and collecting of student data sheets.
3. conferences with teachers and parents for periodic updates.

It was generally conceded that <u>much time was taken away from the actual teaching time of the resource teacher</u>. Several resource teachers admitted to spending long hours after school and on the weekends, in order to get the work done. Others spent some time during the instructional day to do it.

Another problem cited by the resource teacher was the inflexibility of some of the regular teachers in modifying their curriculum in order

to meet the special needs of children. Often teachers were seen as unaware of varying teaching techniques; therefore, they were unable to adapt the instruction to the special education student.

the successful case studies

The successful case studies of the elementary resource teachers were characterized by the individual adult attention. The most common elements of the successful case study were the following:

a. the diagnosis of individual student needs
b. the individualizing of the student's program to meet those needs
c. the development of student motivation
d. the affective support from the teacher and/or aide to build a good self concept
e. the reteaching of underlying skills
f. the teaching on a one-to-one basis; especially of basic skills
g. the immediate correction of mistakes
h. the immediate reinforcement of correct responses
i. a quiet area which allows some space
j. a team effort at the school site
k. parental interest and cooperation

The common elements were often cited as elements of success by both LDC teachers and the classroom teacher. These elements seemed to be key to the success of the special student in the resource and LDC rooms.

summary of the resource teacher interviews

To summarize this section, the resource teachers felt that the Master Plan was successful in serving students formerly unserved; it had resulted in a greater parental involvement with the planning of the student's educational program; it had helped improve the student self concept; and it had reduced the stigma of special education. Their greatest concerns about the Master Plan centered around the effective and efficient functioning of the resource program. The proper placement of students in the resource and LDC classes was also

of great concern. The organizational duties of the resource teacher was considered the single most important thing which kept them from doing as well as they'd like. This concern is appropriate, since the pattern of instruction which seemed to be successful required a high degree of discipline for a proper execution. The successful approach also seemed to require much time, preparation and planning, which was infringed upon by organization duties.

THE REGULAR TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE ELEMENTARY

Improvements due to Master Plan

The regular elementary teacher, for the most part, considered the Master Plan to be a huge success. Many of their comments echoed what the resource teachers had stated. They, generally, were delighted to have the resource teacher available. They stressed some of the following: students were being successfully integrated, while receiving the proper instruction from special education; there was a willingness to serve the teacher by the resource teacher; the resource teacher was helping children that formerly were left to struggle; and these children were given the academic boost that they needed.

the Master Plan concerns

The elementary teacher's great concern was the possibility that Master Plan may not continue. It was feared that Master Plan would get started and then be dropped. They believed that the potential that Master Plan has must be given time. They believed that the funding problems may cause cuts in services to the point of program ineffectiveness. This possible loss of services, which are provided by the Master Plan, was the concern of the majority of the elementary teachers. They believed that the potential that Master Plan has must be given time by proper funding.

A minority concern was with the administrational aspects of the special ed program. Some of the comments were, "The qualifications of aides should be assessed." "There are too many administrators in special education." "The child who is a disturbing influence is integrated into the regular classroom too soon."

suggestions for improvements

The elementary teacher seemed to think that class size was an important thing which kept him from doing as well as he'd like. The needs of the class was seen as the dominating factor. The special ed student need was then considered after this dominating factor. The larger class size resulted in little time being given to the special ed student. The increase of class size also decreased the instructional flexibility.

Others thought that there was little keeping them from being successful with every student. The resource program had provided the necessary support to make this true.

successful case studies

When the elementary teachers were asked what situational factor made the student successful, they gave responses much the same as the elementary resource teachers. The general items listed were: smaller and more appropriate groupings, a positive approach from all teachers, more individual attention, a highly structured learning at the student's ability level, the positive self concept of the student, a team approach and the rebuilding of the skill foundation.

unsuccessful case studies

For the unsuccessful student, the majority of elementary teachers gave a lack of student cooperation as the most significant factor for failure. The poor motivation factor was also considered a failure factor by the resource teacher.

summary of the regular teacher interviews

It could be concluded that the elementary teachers valued the services provided by the resource teachers. The integration of students, as much as possible into the regular classroom, was seen as a worthy goal. Satisfactory progression toward this goal was being made. The great concern was the reduction of services provided the students. The elementary teacher desired to help children with exceptional needs, but were often frustrated by their inability to serve both the exceptional student and the rest of their class. Their successes were seen as due to several factors. Their failures were perceived as due to poor student motivation.

A FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE CASE STUDIES AT THE ELEMENTARY

the successful case studies

The case studies of the successful special ed students were grouped together for all of the elementary. For this total group, a list of areas in which the student was remediated or was making significant progress was compiled. Each student may have been tallied in more than one area, giving percentages which total more than 100%.

Students Successfully Remediated (N=20)

Problem	Percent of students
Reading	60%
Self-Concept	50%
Class behavior	40%
Language	25%
Math	20%
Writing	15%
Social interaction	10%
Visual perception	10%
Comprehension	5%
Auditory	5%

The cases generally support the elementary teacher's view that many of the students were being successfully remediated in self concept and class behavior as well as the academics. The success in reading may be due to the major emphasis on reading in the elementary curriculum. This emphasis was noted by the scheduling of time of the students into early and late reading groups, the Miller-Unruh reading program, and the regular class emphasis on reading.

the unsuccessful case studies

The case studies of students not remediated were similarly evaluated. This list is given below.

Students not Successfully Remediated (N=14)

Problem	Percent of students
Behavioral Problems	71%
Reading	29%
Math	29%
Language	21%
Attendance	21%
Emotional Problems	7%
Visual Problems	7%
Social Interaction	7%

In these cases, the academic area was not the area causing the most problems. The single most cited problem that was unremediated was the behavior problems of the students. This problem was ascribed to 71% of the students. Most of these behavioral problems showed in the classroom behavior, but many were also considered to be based in the home or the community. (Successful remediation may have to include a more intense involvement from the home and community).

THE STRONG/WEAK POINTS OF THE SPECIAL ED PROGRAM AT THE ELEMENTARY

After the first half of the interview schedule, the interviews were read. From this reading, two lists were compiled. One list consisted of the special education strong points as perceived by the elementary teachers. The second list included the weak points. The two lists

were then used in the second half of the schedule. The teachers were asked to agree, disagree to comment on the appropriateness of each statement.

Both lists and their summary are below:

The Strong Points of Special Education at the Elementary (N=11)

Percent Agreement		Statement
91%	1.	There is a team approach to diagnosing and solving student problems.
91%	2.	We are serving students that wouldn't have been served before.
91%	3.	There is more one to one teaching contact.
82%	4.	There is an improvement of the special ed student's self concept.
82%	5.	There is an improvement of the special ed student's behavior.
82%	6.	We are better at assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the special ed student.
82%	7.	Parent and student rights are clarified.
82%	8.	Special ed students have a feeling that there is someone to turn to.
82%	9.	Students feel less uncomfortable toward the handicapped.
73%	10.	There is more social contact of special ed students with regular students.
73%	11.	There is more parent involvement.
64%	12.	Labels are not attached to special ed children. Special ed children feel that they're no different from other children.
46%	13.	There is a greater academic contact of special ed students with other students.
46%	14.	There is a real difference in social flow. Children in special ed are more often friends of children not in special ed.
27%	15.	There is more sharing of staff expertise.

The Weak Points of Special Education at the Elementary. (N=11)

Percent Agreement		Statement
55%	1.	There is too much paperwork, meetings and phone calls for the amount of time.
45%	2.	There needs to be more communication between special ed staff and the regular teaching staff.
45%	3.	There are not enough slots to serve all the children who should be served.
36%	4.	The special ed classes are too large.
36%	5.	Regular teachers have an unrealistic expectation of special ed student work.
36%	6.	The regular class size prohibits integration.
36%	7.	There is a problem with scheduling students into regular classes.
36%	8.	Transient students are not in the program long enough.
36%	9.	There is a problem with misplaced students.
36%	10.	There is a need for help in modifying the curriculum to meet the special ed students' needs.
27%	11.	There are organizational problems of students schedule and work.
27%	12.	Student motivation is lacking.
27%	13.	There is a need for basic criteria for placement of special ed students.
27%	14.	There are attendance problems of special ed students.
27%	15.	Supplies and curricular materials are needed.
18%	16.	Aides do most of the teaching because of paperwork.
9%	17.	There is a confusion as to which supervisor to go to for help, the special ed administrator or the principal.
0%	18.	There is a need for a study hall for kids with special problems.

Several items in the four lists seem to contradict each other. Self concept and class behavior are believed to be being remediated as shown in the first list. In the second list behavior problems are the most unremediated problems. Yet, one of the strong points of the special education program seems to be the improvement of special ed student self-concept and behavior. One must then conclude that significant gains are being made in student behavior, but that in many of the cases this remains a difficult problem. The general academic area seems to be a major area in which remediation is successful.

THE ELEMENTARY STUDENT INTERVIEWS

The primary emphasis of the student interviews was to see if integration of the students was progressing satisfactorily. In the investigation of integration, four major aspects were considered: academic integration, social integration, labeling and stigma. In conducting the interviews, care was taken to avoid the use of labels. Though the interviews were semi-structured, each student was interviewed in an open, friendly accepting manner. Any hint of stigma on the part of the interviewer was also avoided.

academic integration

Each of the special education students encountered were carefully quizzed as to who their teachers were and what subject they were taking. The LDC students took the following classes with the regular students:

Total (N=15)

No regular classes	47%
Physical education	40%
Social studies	20%
Reading	13%
Art	7%
Math	7%
Music	7%
Science	7%
Spelling	7%
Language	7%

Forty-seven percent of LDC students had no regular classes. If they were in fact in a regular class, it was usually physical education. This was understandable, since the LDC student was considered by the teachers to be a behavioral problem. The tendency would, then, be to integrate into the more active, less structured classes. Often the teachers stated that the LDC student was integrated simply for social reasons.

The resource student was also questioned regarding the classes he was taking. The classes that the resource students were taking in the resource room are show below:
(Total N=19)

Reading	68%
Math	58%
Language	32%
Spelling	26%
Writing	11%
Drawing	5%
Memory work	5%
History	5%

The primary classes in which the resource student receives remediation appeared to be in the basic skills areas. The reading, math, and language skills were the basic skills in which remediation was usually attempted. Often, these the resource classes were taken in addition to the regular classwork in the same area. The resource student was usually in the resource room for either one or two subjects.

The academic integration into the regular class could vary from no integration for the LDC student to all but one subject for the resource student. It could be hypothesized that the LDC student would be less socially integrated than the resource student.

social integration

The students were asked, if they had friends in the various special education rooms. These questions were worded so as to use the teacher names rather than special class names. The percent of the students who responded in the affirmative are below:

Location of Friends in Special Education

Questions	Type of student responding (N=16) LDC Student	(N=23) Resource Student	(N=18) Regular Student
Do you have friends in the LDC room?	100%*	60%	40%
Do you have friends in the resource room?	39%	92%	60%
Do you have friends in regular class	78%	100%	--

* percentage answering yes

The above chart indicates that a higher percentage of regular students had friends who were students in the resource room than were students in the LDC room. All of the resource students had friends in the regular class and a large number also had friends in the resource room. The LDC students always had a friend in the LDC room and usually had a friend in the regular class. From this one may conclude that none of the classes were completely isolated socially from the other classes.

The special education students were also asked in which room most of their friends were. They were given the LDC classroom, the resource classroom, or the regular classroom teacher names as a choice. The results are below.

Location of the greatest number of friends

Location	Type of student responding LDC (N=18)	RSP (N=25)
The LDC Room	66%	0%
The Resource Room	0%	4%
The Regular Class	34%	96%

The above chart suggests that for most of the LDC students their primary social group consisted of mostly students in the LDC classroom. But, the resource students' social group was usually included in the regular class. From this, it would seem logical to conclude that the resource students were more socially integrated than the LDC students for this study.

labeling

The investigation of labeling was approached by use of one main leading question. The students were asked, "do you know what special education is?" The responses were as follows:

Type of student responding	Yes	No
LDC (N=17)	18%	82%
RSP (N=25)	36%	64%
Regular (N=23)	30%	70%

The students for the most part were unaware of what special education is. The students who responded in the affirmative, usually described special education as being for children who need extra help. All of the descriptions of special education were phrased by the students in a positive manner. No derogatory labels were used in their descriptions. But, in two of the eight schools, the use of derogatory labels were reported. The use of labels were reported to be used to harass an LDC student, but never a resource student.

stigma

The interviewer carefully read and reread the transcript of each

interview to ascertain, if any stigma at all, was attached to the special education classes. Each student interviewed was judged to be one of four categories: some stigma, no stigma, unknown or doesn't know anyone in special education. The results are given below:

Judgement of Stigma

LDC Students (N=18)	
Some stigma	22%
No stigma	72%
Unknown	6%

Resource Students (N=25)	
Some stigma	20%
No stigma	80%
Unknown	0%

Regular Students (N=23)	
Some stigma	13%
No stigma	83%
Doesn't know anyone in special ed	4%

The results above seem to suggest that there is still some stigma attached to special education classes by a minority of students (the results on stigma should be seen as approximate. A double bias may have been introduced. The results should be replicated.)

It appears, therefore, that the special ed student was affected in the four areas investigated. The LDC student was more academically and socially isolated than the resource student. Even though, the students were generally unaware of what special education was all about, there was some labeling of special ed students, but always by other students. Some stigma was also attached to being in a special education class.

the value of the special education class

Another section of the interview concentrated on the value of the special education class as percieved by the special education student. The initial question asked was, "Does working in the LDC (or resource) room help you?" The results were surprising. In

every case, the LDC student said that the LDC room did, in fact, help him; and in every case, the resource student said that the resource room has helped him.

The follow up question was, "Why do you like being in the LDC (or resource) room?" The answers for both areas usually contained the idea that the special education class helped them learn. Some sample comments are given below:

LDC student comments

c1: Because they go back to your level and work up

c2: 'Cause I'm learning in all subjects.

c3: With the work. I'm learning in Mrs. B's class.

Resource student comments

c4: Well, he helps me and stuff when I'm stuck. And he likes me; I know that.

c5: It teaches me -like I've already learned the times tables, division, and I'm doing fractions. It helps me learn (why?) Because he pays more attention to me. Mrs. J talked to the whole class, he just talks to me.

c6: It helps me in handwriting. Before, my hand used to shake. By doing all of these pages, my hand stopped shaking. Didn't like language, now I'm more interested in it.

If the special education students are to be believed, they are learning more in the special education classes. They're learning more math, reading and language. In order to test further how the students valued the special education classes, special education students were asked, "Is there another class in which you would rather be?". The results are given below:

LDC Students	
Yes	44%
No	56%
Resource Students	
Yes	28%
No	72%

The LDC students who answered in the affirmative usually suggested that they would rather be in a regular class. The reasons given were usually either for social reasons or because they liked the regular teacher. The resource students for the most part were satisfied with their placement.

CONCLUSIONS FOR THE ELEMENTARY

This section was organized in three parts. These parts were related to the main thrusts of the study which were discussed in the introduction. The parts were: satisfaction with the master plan, suggestions for improvements and the integration of the special ed student.

<u>satisfaction with the Master Plan</u>

Generally, most elementary teachers seemed satisfied with the Master Plan. The regular teacher viewed the Resource Specialist program as a welcome source of help for his students, with difficulties. The Resource Specialist Program teacher saw these students as making gains in reading, self-concept and class behavior. The LDC teachers felt that they now had an opportunity to integrate their students. Generally, the teachers felt there were improvements in:

- diagnosing the strengths and weaknesses of special ed students
- placing students in a more appropriate way with more program flexibility
- increasing the communication with parents
- teaching students in a manner which was more successful

and also improvements in:

- the special ed student's self concept
- the special ed student's class behavior
- the special ed student's academic work especially reading

The students generally felt that they were receiving the help that they needed. Most of the resource students liked where they were placed. But, a large portion of the LDC students wanted to be in

the regular class. They wanted this, even though they thought they were being helped. The LDC student also seemed to receive the most harassment from the other students. But generally, the stigma attached to special education appeared to have decreased.

Integration of special ed students

Integration seemed to be progressing satisfactorily. None of the classes were isolated socially from the other classes. The LDC was more isolated academically than the resource student. Probably for this cause, the resource students were more socially integrated than the LDC students. A large portion of the LDC students desired to be in the regular class. This desire seemed to be based on social reasons. In spite of this, they viewed the special class as a real help to learning. The resource student seemed satisfactorily integrated in every way. Most of their friends were in the regular class. They viewed the resource class very much the same as any other class which takes them out of their home room such as band or physical education.

The teachers for the most part felt that the integration of the special ed student was successful. But, they had reservations about integrating students with unresolved class behavior problems. On the whole, at the elementary level, a great measure of student integration both academically and social has taken place. It appeared that the most inhibiting factor to the successful integration of the resource and LDC student was the unresolved class behavior problems.

suggestions for program improvement

Generally the problem areas reported were problems with the diagnosis and placement of the special ed student. A majority agreed that their administrative duties related to the diagnosis and placement of the special ed students were cumbersome and time consuming. The

special ed teachers felt that misplacement was often a problem especially the placement of behavioral problems. More counseling and psychological services in the area of behavioral remediation were requested by the LDC teachers. Finally, there seems to be a need for more communication between the special ed staff and the regular teaching staff.

INTRODUCTION

The intermediate school sample consisted of four schools. Salk, Barrett, Carnegie, and Churchill. The interviews were conducted mainly around the first interview questionnaire. Therefore, there was no section on the strong/weak points included for these schools. The organization of this section of the report was the same as the elementary section. The various teachers were reported and then the students.

THE LEARNING DEVELOPMENT CLASS TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE INTERMEDIATE

Improvements due to master plan

The greatest improvement that the intermediate LDC teacher perceived was the lowering of the adult/pupil ratio. One teacher suggested that peer relationships had improved as a result of Master Plan. Another teacher suggested that the mainstreaming was discouraged by the LDC class. He suggested that the regular class teacher was often reluctant to take in the LDC student.

the master plan concerns

The Master Plan concerns centered around the proper placement of the LDC student. There was concern about the placement/diagnosis process. There was also a concern about the placement of LDC students in the regular class. The regular teachers were viewed as inadequately prepared for these students.

suggestions for improvement

The streamlining of paperwork was the major concern of the LDC intermediate teachers. This paperwork was perceived to take the LDC teacher away from his classroom duties.

the case studies

The successful cases cited by the LDC teachers were attributed to serveral factors. They are as follows:

- the building of self confidence
- a correct diagnosis and implementation of the program to meet his needs
- the student was properly motivated
- the close one-to-one learning contact by the teacher

the unsuccessful cases were attributed to:

- poor student motivation
- misplacement of the student
- no social acceptance of the student by his peers

summary of the intermediate LDC teacher interviews

To summarize this section, the intermediate LDC teachers felt the Master Plan was successful in reducing the adult/pupil ratio. They were concerned about the placement of the LDC student in both the LDC and regular class. The single most important suggestion was to streamline the paperwork surrounding the placement, diagnosis, and reassessment of the students. The successful cases were attributed to the more personal diagnosis, placement and meeting of student needs. The unsuccessful cases were seen as due to poor motivation and misplacement of students.

THE INTERMEDIATE RESOURCE TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Improvements due to master plan

The greatest improvement of Master Plan was perceived as the serving of more students. These students were formerly in the "gray area". They did not qualify for the special education classes, but had learning problems. The RSP was seen as meeting these student's needs. In doing this, special education had broken out of the old molds to put an emphasis on integration.

the master plan concerns

The Master Plan concerns seemed to fall into several categories. Two categories are below:

- That the Master Plan may not continue. The RSP teachers seemed to value their program. Any threat to the program was viewed with concern.
- The paperwork and administrative aspects of the program.

suggestions for improvement

The suggestions for improvement consistently pointed to the organizational duties. The time problem seemed to be a consistent problem. One teacher listed all the competing clerical and scheduling duties.

the case studies

The factors which the RSP teachers attributed to the successful cases were many. The categories are below:

a. a one-to-one teaching relationship
b. honest counseling with respect to the disability
c. respecting the child's rights - a minimum of criticism
d. encouragement was given. The child was given a feeling of importance.

The factors which the RSP teachers attributed to the unsuccessful case fell into several categories. These are:

a. no student motivation
b. misplacement
c. no parental involvement
d. absentees

summary of the intermediate RSP teacher interviews

Generally, the RSP teachers felt that they were indeed meeting the needs of students. These students were formerly unserved. They were concerned about the paperwork and clerical duties that they performed. The suggestions for improvement were usually aimed at these duties. The successful case was usually seen as due to the honest, caring teaching relationship found in the one-to-one situation. The unsuccessful case seemed to stem from poor student motivation, poor parental involvement, and incorrect diagnosis of student needs.

THE REGULAR TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE INTERMEDIATE

Improvements due to master plan

The regular teacher viewpoint on improvements was much the same as the RSP teacher. The student that was formerly failing was now seen as getting the individualized help that he needed. The regular teachers liked having the additional people as a resource.

the master plan concerns

The regular teachers were concerned about a single subject. They felt that there were more students with needs than teachers, to meet the needs. It was generally asserted that there were not enough slots to serve the special child.

suggestions for improvements

The regular teacher suggestions for improvement did not follow a single theme. The items presented were:

- more special classes were needed
- reduce the regular class size
- increase the communication and coordination with special teachers
- reduce the paperwork

summary of the regular teacher interviews at the intermediate

The intermediate teachers valued the added services. They felt that student's needs were being met. But, they felt that more students could be served by special education at the intermediate school. They felt that in order to do this, more special classes were needed; the regular class size should be reduced; the paperwork should be reduced; and the communication between teachers should increase.

A FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE CASES STUDIES AT THE INTERMEDIATE

Like the elementary, the case studies of successful special ed students were grouped together for all of the intermediate levels. For this total group, a list of areas of student progress were compiled.

Student Problems Remediated (N=15)

Problem	% of Students
Social skills	47%
Reading skills	33%
Class behavior	27%
Math skills	27%
Emotional problems	20%
Motivation	20%
Self concept	20%
Writing skills	20%
Attendence	7%
Spelling	7%

Student Problem Unremediated (N=15)

Problem	% of Students
Motivation	33%
Class behavior	20%
No knowledge of such a student	20%
Social skills	13%
Self concept	13%
Emotional problems	7%
Reading	7%

The majority of students seemed to have been remediated in the non-academic areas such as social skills, class behavior, emotional problems, motivation and self concept. But many were also remediated in reading, math and writing. The student problems which were unremediated were primarily in the non academic areas such as motivation, class behavior, social skills and self concept.

THE INTERMEDIATE STUDENT INTERVIEWS

The primary emphasis of the student interviews was the satisfactory integration of special ed students. The four major aspects were again considered: academic integration, social integration, labeling and stigma.

academic integration

The special ed students were questioned regarding the subjects that they were taking. The LDC students took the following classes with regular students:

Total (N=10)

Physical education	70%
Core-English/language	30%
Reading.	20%
No regular classes	20%
Typing	10%
Agriculture	10%
Art	10%
Health	10%
Choir	10%
Janitor Aide	10%

This situation seemed different than at the elementary. Only twenty percent of the LDC students had no regular classes, but seventy percent were integrated for physical education.

The resource student was also quizzed regarding the classes he was taking. The classes that the resource students were taking are below:

Total (N=10)

Math	80%
Core-English/language	60%
Reading	50%
Spelling	40%
History	40%
Writing	10%

Again the areas in which the resource student was remediated appeared to be in the basic skills areas. Often several resource classes were taken by a single student.

social integration

The students were asked, if they had friends in the various special education rooms. These questions were worded so as to use the teacher names. The percent of the students who responded in the affirmative are below:

LOCATION OF FRIENDS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

	Type of student responding		
	(N=10)	(N=11)	(N=10)
Questions	LDC Student	RSP Student	Regular Student
Do you have friends in the LDC room?	100%	9%	25%
Do you have friends in the resource room?	50%	73%	25%
Do you have friends in the regular class?	80%	100%	--

The above chart indicates that the regular student has less friends in the special classes than at the elementary level. But the LDC student does have some friends outside the LDC class. The RSP student has friends both outside and inside the RSP room.

The special education students were also asked in which room most of their friends were. They were given the LDC classroom, the resource classroom or the regular classroom teacher names as a choice. The results are below:

LOCATION OF THE GREATEST NUMBER OF FRIENDS
Type of student responding

Location	LDC (N=18)	RSP (N=25)
LDC Room	50%	0%
Resource Room	0%	18%
Regular Class	50%	82%

The LDC student has more of his friends located outside of the LDC classroom than the elementary LDC student. But, at least half of the students replied that most of the friends were in the LDC room. The intermediate resource students like the elementary resource students were more socially integrated than the intermediate LDC student.

labeling

In the investigation of labeling the students were asked, "Do you know what special education is?" The responses are below:

Type of student responding

		Yes	No
LDC	(N=11)	82%	18%
RSP	(N=11)	64%	36%
Reg.	(N= 9)	44%	56%

The intermediate was much more aware of special education. He had more knowledge about special education, the more he was involved with it. The use of derogatory terms seemed to increase in the interviews of students at this level compared to the elementary.

stigma

The interviewer carefully judged each interview for stigma regarding special education. The judgements are below:

LDC Students (N=10)

Some Stigma	60%
No Stigma	20%
Unknown	20%

Resource Students (N=11)

Some Stigma	9%
No Stigma	82%
Unknown	9%

Judgement as to whether the regular student attaches stigma to special education. (N=10)

Some Stigma	30%
No Stigma	40%
Unknown	0%
Doesn't know Anyone in Special Ed	30%

The stigma attached to special education seemed to increase in a marked way for the intermediate LDC student, as compared to the elementary LDC student. The intermediate RSP students remained the same. The regular students at the intermediate level seemed to know less people involved with special ed.

It appears, therefore, that the LDC student was the most affected in the four areas investigated. He was satisfactorily integrated academically, but socially he was not. He knew the most about special ed, but he used more labels (often in a demeaning way) to describe other LDC students or had labels used on himself. He also was perceived to have attached the most stigma to special ed.

the value of special education

When asked the question, "Does working in the special class help you?" the result was surprising. Again in almost every case the students responded that special education did help them.

When asked, "Is there another class in which you would rather be?" the results seemed to reflect the judgements of stigma. The results are below.

LDC Students

Yes	70%
No	30%

Resource Students

Yes	11%
No	89%

Generally, the resource students seemed much more satisfied with their placement than the LDC student.

CONCLUSIONS FOR THE INTERMEDIATE

Like the elementary level this section was organized in three parts. The parts were: satisfaction with Master Plan, suggestions for improvement, and the integration of the special ed student.

satisfaction with the master plan

Generally, most of the intermediate teachers welcomed the master plan. They liked the resource specialist program. Generally, they felt there were improvements in:

- the adult/pupil ratio
- the serving of students formerly unserved

The students generally felt that they were receiving the help that they needed. The resource student agreed with their placement. But, a very large portion of the LDC students did not.

the integration of the special ed students

The LDC student seemed to be more integrated academically at the intermediate level, but was less integrated socially than the elementary LDC student. Most of the LDC students did not like their placement. The RSP students were more satisfactorily integrated and placed from their viewpoint.

The teachers generally felt that there was an increase in the integration of the special ed student. The LDC teacher did seem to have problems integrating the LDC student.

suggestions for program improvement

At the intermediate level, the major area of concern was in the area of organizational duties. Teachers consistently expressed a desire for a streamlining of the paperwork and other duties outside of the normal classroom function. It was often suggested that more time be allotted for these duties. Other concerns were in the area of class size. The regular teacher suggested that more special classes were needed; the regular class size should be reduced; and the communication between teachers should increase.

THE HIGH SCHOOL INTERVIEWS

INTRODUCTION

The high school interview sample included Rio Americano, Mesa Verde, Encina, and Mira Loma. Rio Americano was used to pilot the first interview questionnaire. The second questionnaire was used on the last three. The high school interviews were pursued in very much the same way as the intermediate and elementary interviews. The follow-up questions were usually phrased in a more complicated way. One question of the student interview was changed. The question, "Is there another class in which you'd rather be?" was replaced by, "If you could change your class schedule how would you?"

The following high school report was organized very much the same way as the intermediate and secondary reports. The various teacher interviews were reported first, then the student interviews.

THE LEARNING DEVELOPMENT CLASS TEACHER AT THE HIGH SCHOOL

Improvements due to master plan

The high school LDC teachers agreed with the elementary LDC teachers that integration was a valuable thrust of Master Plan. The LDC students seemed open to outsiders. There was more social contact. Another improvement was the delabeling of students. This was considered good for both the regular and handicapped kids.

Other LDC teachers suggested that they were mainstreaming before, the implementation of Master Plan. They also maintained that the actual practice, had not changed except the compliance aspects.

the master plan concerns

The Master Plan concerns of the high school LDC teacher fell into two major categories. Thes categories are as follows:

Organizational duties - The amount of time which the LDC teacher has to spend on paperwork, parent contact, planning for the student, etc., was considered excessive. They, generally, were concerned about the focus on paperwork rather than the classroom teaching.

Administration of special ed - Several of the LDC teachers voiced an opinion that the special education was of a size that it was difficult to manage. One teacher suggested that it was unclear as to which supervisor to go to for supplies and the upgrading of facilities. Another suggested that the hierachical structure was unweildy.

suggestions for improvement

The high school LDC teacher suggestions for improvement were grouped as follows:

Paperwork - Again, this was considered the number one problem area. Many of the teachers suggested that this paperwork should be streamlined. They felt that much time and energy is wasted on this aspect.

More psychological services - A quarter of the LDC teachers expressed a need for psychological services. They suggested that the need was in the counseling area. Again, the teachers that asked for more counseling psychological services usually cited what seemed to be a student with severe problems.

the successful case studies

The factor most cited as important to the success of the LDC student was the individualized instruction and attention. Other factors cited were: proper motivation of the student; counseling with respect to his disability; personal interest; and the flexibility of the program to meet his needs.

One teacher carefully outlined what he considered to be the successful approach. This approach seemed to be the epitome of the successful method. It was expressed in the following list:

1. The student's problem was diagnosed.
2. A prescription was formulated from this diagnosis.
3. Then he tried to relate to the student. He found some common areas of interest.
4. Slowly academic materials were given to the student from this area of interest.
5. Trust in the teacher was slowly built.
6. Behavior modification was used to provide further motivation.

7. The student's self-concept was fortified by praise.
8. There was a weekly meeting with the student to provide summary feedback.
9. The student recorded his own daily progress.
10. The student as a side product developed a respect for the teacher.

the unsuccessful case studies

The high school LDC teachers considered the main reason for failure to be some deep emotional problem in the student. Fifty-seven per cent of the LDC teachers suggested further psychological diagnosis and counseling in the cases they considered not properly served. It was suggested that some of the students had deep seated personal problems with which the program was not dealing. Two of the case studies are examples of this. (see appendix V, case 11 and case 12)

summary of the high school LDC teacher interviews

The high school LDC teachers considered integration and delabeling to be an important and valuable thrust of Master Plan. They were concerned about the time allotted for organizational duties such as paperwork, parent contact, planning for the student, etc. They were also concerned about the proper administration of special ed and its seemingly unweildy growth. They suggested a streamlining of the paperwork. A desire for more intensive psychological services was expressed. This lack was seen most often as a failure factor in the unsuccessful cases. Individual attention and instruction was most often considered the important factor for success.

THE RESOURCE TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE HIGH SCHOOL

the improvements due to master plan

The high school RSP teacher saw that the major improvement was the new found flexibility to serve the students formerly unserved. These students were felt to have been turned out of school with real academic and emotional problems. The RSP was now meeting these needs while providing for more social growth due to integration. In the process, the RSP teachers felt that the regular teacher became more aware of student disabilities and adjusted their teaching to these disabilites.

the master plan concerns

The RSP teachers were generally pleased with Master Plan. Their biggest concern was the loss of flexibility. This flexibility loss was threatened by:

a. paperwork and organization duties
b. a possibility that more regulations may be written into the program.
c. a lessening of local school cooperation.
d. a being less open to ideas.
e. a setting of limits on the RSP.

suggestions for improvement

The high school RSP teachers suggested two areas that need improvement. The first, which involves paperwork, has been adequately discussed. The second is a need for curricular materials and equipment. Communication was often a problem both with parents and with in the school. Several RSP teachers suggested that they needed an intercom. Several also desired a telephone. Another RSP teacher noted a lack of desks and chairs. Several teachers also noted that they had a lack of appropriate curricular materials such as encyclopedias, language masters, etc. They suggested that the materials provided were often not suited for the high school student.

the successful case studies

The high school resource teachers suggested that for their successful students they had provided close contact. This close contact was exhibited in several ways. The approach was one very similar to the other RSP teachers. Their approach included:

a. motivation of the student
b. desensitizing of the fear of by the building of trust
c. communication with the family
d. emotional and academic tutoring of an intensity not normally found at the high school

the unsuccessful case studies

The factors for not having success in the students seemed to revolve around the motivational aspects. Attendence and truancy seemed to be a problem. The student was seen as having a feeling of failure.

He was considered to be difficult to motivate to achieve. At the high school level this problem was expressed as attendence problems and truancy.

summary of the high school resource teacher interviews

The high school RSP teachers generally felt that the resource specialist program was a success. The students that were turned out with emotional and academic problems were being served while at the same time, providing for social growth. They expressed a concern that in the future the flexibility of the program may be impaired by outside factors. They expressed a need for curricular materials and equipment and, they suggested that much has been gained by the use of a successful approach. But, they indicated that there were still motivational, attendence and truancy problems to overcome.

THE REGULAR TEACHER INTERVIEWS AT THE HIGH SCHOOL

the master plan concerns

The regular teachers concerns did not seem to have a general theme. The comments seemed to range from fear of having a handicapped student placed to comments on the easy access of the RSP teacher.

the suggestions for improvement

The regular teachers expressed a need for more information about special ed children in their classrooms. Several teachers desired counseling as to placement, handling and meeting of student needs, and student progress. Others suggested that further inservicing may be in order.

the case studies

Generally, the regular high school teacher agreed that in most of the successful cases, the special ed teacher had motivated the students toward positive learning habits. Most of the students integrated were willing to work, had a good self confidence and attitude.

The unsuccessful cases were attributed to a lack of awareness of how to handle the handicapped student. Other teachers felt that they were relatively unaware of handicapped children in their classes.

the summary of the regular high school teacher interviews

The high school teachers were appreciative of Master Plan especially the new opportunity for socialization by the special ed student. For the most part the high school teachers seemed to have a general lack of knowledge of special education and special ed children. Often the teachers expressed a feeling of inadequacy in dealing with the handicapped students assigned to them.

A FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE CASE STUDIES

The case studies of successful special ed students were grouped together for all of the high schools. The area of remediation was compiled.

Students Successfully Served
at the High School (N=14)

Problem	Percentage of Students
Self-concept	44%
Social skills	39%
Attendence	33%
Math skills	22%
Writing	22%
Class behavior	22%
Reading	17%
Motor skills	11%
No knowledge of such a student	6%

The students not well served were also grouped. Their problem areas were also compiled.

Students Not Successfully Served (N=14)

Problem	Percentage of Students
No knowiede of such a student	33%
Attendence	33%
Class behavior	17%
Motivation	11%
Self-concept	11%
Emotional problems	11%
Reading	6%
Math	6%
Writing	6%
Life preparation	6%

The cases that special education at the high school level most successfully served seems to be in the nonacademic areas. The areas of self-concept, social skills and attendence were the more successful areas. These seemingly were important prerequisites to academic success.

The factors for no success similarly seem to fall in the non-academic areas. Attendence, class behavior, motivation, self concept and emotional problems headed the list.

THE STRONG/WEAK POINTS OF THE SPECIAL ED PROGRAM AT THE HIGH SCHOOL

The lists of strong and weak points for the high school were compiled in the same way that the elementary list was compiled. In this case three of the four high schools were included. All of the teachers were asked to agree, disagree or to comment on the appropriateness of each statement. Both lists are summarized below:

The Strong Points of Special Education at the High School (N=14)

Percent Agreement		Statement
100%	1.	There is an improvement of student self-concept
100%	2.	Special ed students have a feeling that there is someone to turn to.
92%	3.	There is more one-to-one teaching contact.
92%	4.	There is more social contact of special ed students with regular students.
85%	5.	There is a team approach to diagnosing and solving.
77%	6.	There is an improvement of student behavior
77%	7.	We are serving students that wouldn't have been served before.
62%	8.	There is a real difference in social flow.
62%	9.	Students feel less uncomfortable toward the handicapped.
62%	10.	There is a sharing of staff expertise.
54%	11.	There is more academic contact of special ed.
54%	12.	There is more parental involvement.
54%	13.	We are better at assessing the strengths and weaknesses of special ed students.
54%	14.	Parent and student rights are clarified.
46%	15.	No labels are attached to kids. Kids feel that they are no different from other kids.

The Weak Points of Special Education at the High School (N=18)

Percent Agreement		Statement
85%	1.	Supplies and curricular materials are needed.
77%	2.	There is too much paperwork, meetings and phone calls for the amount of time.
70%	3.	There needs to be more communication between the special ed teachers and the regular teachers.
54%	4.	There are attendence problems of special ed students.
46%	5.	The regular class size prohibits integration.
46%	6.	There is a problem with scheduling students into regular classes.
46%	7.	There are not enough slots to serve all the children who should be served.
38%	8.	There is a need for basic critaria for placement.
31%	9.	Regular teachers have an unrealistic expectation of special ed student work.
23%	10.	Special ed classes are too large.
23%	11.	There is a problem with misplaced students.
23%	12.	There are organizational problems of student scheduling and work.
23%	13.	Student motivation is lacking.
15%	14.	There is need for help in modifying the curriculum to meet the special ed student needs.
15%	15.	Aides do most of the teaching because of paperwork.
8%	16.	There is a need for a study hall for kids with special problems.
8%	17.	There is a confusion as to which supervisor to go to the principal of the school or the special ed administrator.
0%	18.	Transcient students are not in the program long enough.

If these teachers are to be considered to be representative, then Master Plan was working at the high school level. It is believed that there is an improvement of student self concept and that special ed students definately have someone to turn to. Most teachers (92%) believe that there is a greater contact between special ed students and regular student. This seems to have reslulted in the students having friends with handicapped students. The individual attention seems to have resulted in improved student behavior and more parental involvement.

THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT INTERVIEWS

In the student interviews, integration was the primary focal point. In the investigation of integration, four major aspects were considered: academic integration, social integration, labeling and stigma. In the interview process, care was taken to avoid the use of labels and any hint of stigma.

academic integration

The students were carefully quizzed as to what classes they were taking. The main question behind their interviews was "were they, in fact, being integrated?" The teachers believed this was happening. The LDC students took the following classes with the regular students:

Total (N=7)

P.E.	43%
Shop, auto mec.	43%
Social studies	29%
Work experience	29%
Business math	14%
Horticulture	14%
Driver's ed	14%
Health and Safety	14%
Math	14%
No regular classes	14%

The integration seemed to be much better than at the elementary level. Only 14% of the LDC students were not taking regular classes as compared to forty-seven percent at the elementary. When integrated the LDC students usually took the non-academic classes such as P.E., shop, work experiense, business machines, etc.

The resource student was also asked to name the classes that he was taking. The classes that they were taking are shown below:

Total (N=9)

English	67%
History	44%
Reading	22%
Civics	22%
Math	11%
Spelling	11%
Social science	11%

The resource students seem to be in special ed for the more verbal classes usually centering around the requirements for graduation. Much of the remediation would appear to involve language and language usage.

social integration

The high school students were also asked if they had friends in the various rooms. The percent of the students who responded in the affirmative are below:

LOCATION OF FRIEND IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

	Type of student responding (N=11) LDC Student	(N=9) RSP Student	(N=9) Regular Student
Do you have friends in the LDC room?	100%	33%	33%
Do you have friends in the resource room?	27%	100%	44%
Do you have friends in the regular class?	90%	100%	--

The above chart suggests that high school students are less socially isolated than the elementary LDC students. The RSP students are less isolated than the LDC student at the high school.

The high school special ed student was also asked in which classroom most of their friends were. The results are below.

LOCATION OF THE GREATEST NUMBER OF FRIENDS

	Type of student responding	
Location	LDC (N=11)	RSP (N=9)
LDC Room	36%	0%
Resource Room	0%	0%
Regular Class	55%	100%
Uncertain	9%	--

The above chart again suggests that the LDC student was not completely integrated socially. Thirty-six percent of the LDC students considered the LDC room to be their primary social group at school.

labeling

The use of labeling was approached again by the use of the one main leading question. The students were asked, "Do you know what special education is?" The responses are below.

		Type of student responding	
		Yes	No
LDC	(N=10)	80%	20%
RSP	(N= 9)	66%	33%
Regular	(N=12)	58%	42%

The high school students were much more aware of what special education was. The awareness of special education was greater as one was more involved with it. Just less than half of the regular students could not give a definition of special education. Those that could give a definition of special education usually phrased them in a less positive manner than at the elementary.

stigma

The interviewer's judgement of stigma was recorded for each interview. The results are given below.

Judgement of Stigma

LDC Students (N=12)	
Some Stigma	25%
No Stigma	58%
Unknown	17%

Resource Students (N=10)	
Some Stigma	10%
No Stigma	80%
Unknown	10%

Judgement as to whether the regular student attaches stigma to the special ed student.

Regular Students (N=12)	
Some Stigma	18%
No Stigma	45%
Doesn't Know Anyone In Special Ed	36%

The LDC student seems to attach more stigma to special education than the RSP student. From this data it could be concluded that there is still some stigma attached to special education, but it seems to be confined to about 20% of the students.

It appears that the high school special ed student was affected mildly in all areas. The LDC student was still academically isolated in some cases, but this was less than in the elementary. The high school student was generally more aware of special ed, but this did not seem to result in an increase in stigma.

the value of the special education class

The question asked in the interviews was, "Does working in the special class help you?" Again, the responses were surprising. In every case, the LDC student said that the LDC room did, in fact, help him; and in every case the resource student said that the resource room helped him.

The follow up question was, "why do you like being in the special class?" And in every case the students indicated that the reason was due to greater learning."

This attitude was again reflected when they were asked the question, "would you like your schedule of classes changed?" The results are below:

LDC Students	
Yes	10%
No	90%

Resource Students	
Yes	11%
No	89%

Roughly the same proportions of response were reported. This indicates that the LDC and RSP students were equally satisfied with their placement.

CONCLUSIONS FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL

This section was organized in three parts. These parts were: satisfaction with the Master Plan, suggestions for improvements and the integration of the special ed student.

satisfaction with the master plan

Most of the high school teachers interviewed seemed satisfied with the Master Plan. The LDC teacher saw integration and delabeling as important improvements. The RSP teacher saw the serving of the students formerly unserved as an important thrust of Master Plan. The regular teachers saw the opportunity for socialization by the special ed student was a major improvement. Generally, the teachers felt there were improvements in:

- student self concept
- student/teacher contact
- student social skills
- student attendence
- diagnosing student problems

The students generally felt they were receiving the help that they needed. A major portion of the students (90%) liked where they were placed. This satisfaction was greater than at either the intermediate or the elementary levels.

integration of special ed students

The integration of the high school special student seemed to have been greater than at the elementary or intermediate levels. Their student academic participation was greater. Only fourteen percent of the LDC students had no regular classes. The social integration of the LDC student was also greater. But, for the LDC student, thirty-six percent of the students considered the LDC class to be their primary social group at school. The RSP students seemed satisfactorily integrated. There also seemed to be a minimum amount of stigma attached to special ed. The students who do feel this stigma may tend to be quite harsh with themselves and others.

suggestions for improvement

Generally, the problems reported centered around the paperwork, organizational duties and the organization of special ed. It was suggested that more psychological services could be provided. Curricular materials and equipment was also a need. More communication with regular teachers was also suggested.

APPENDIX I

IST QUESTIONNAIRE

Regular _____ RSP _____ LDC _____ Aide _____

Teacher Questions

1. What kind of special ed students do you serve?

2. Describe a student that you feel has been well served by special ed.

3. Why was this approach successful?

4. Describe a student that you feel has not been well served by special ed.

5. Why was this approach unsuccessful?

6. What do you feel is the greatest success of master plan (mainstreaming, integration, etc)?

7. What things are keeping you from doing as well as you'd like with special ed students?

8. What are your greatest concerns with respect to master plan?

RSP _____ LDC_____

School_____ Date _____

Special Student Questions

1. How old are you?
2. In what grade are you?
3. What subject do you like best?

4. Do you know what Special Education is?
   (If not, give a brief description of Special Ed.)

5. Have you ever been in a special class (or received special help in the regular class)? For what subject? Who teaches you?

6. Do you have firends that are in a special class (or receive special help in your class)? What teacher do most of your friends have?

7. Tell me about someone else that is in your special class (or receives special help in your class).

8. How do you feel _____ is like you? (Same as you?)

9. How do you feel _____ is different from you?

10A (RSP only) Do you feel you shold receive the same kind of help as _____? Why or why not?

10B (LDC only) Is there another class in which you would rather be? Why would (or wouldn't) you like to be in other class?

11. Does working in _____'s room help you? How?

12. How could your teacher(s) help you better?

Regular Student Questions

1. How old are you?
2. In what grade are you?
3. What subject do you like best?

4. Do you know what Special Education is?
   (If not, give a brief explanation of Special Ed.)

5. Have you ever been in a special class?
   Have you received extra help from a special ed teacher or aide?

6. Do you have a friend who receives special help?
   Where does he receive it?

7. Tell me about someone you know that receives special help.

8. How do you feel _____ is like you?

9. How do you feel _____ is different from you?

10. Do you feel _____ should receive special help?

APPENDIX II

2ND QUESTIONNAIRE

School _____ Date _____

Regular _____ RSP _____ LDC_____ Other _____

1. What kind of special ed students do you serve?

2. Describe a student that you feel has been well served by special ed.

3. Why was this approach successful?

4. Describe a student that you feel has not been well served by special ed.

5. Why was the approach unsuccessful?

6. What do you feel is the greatest success of master plan?

7. What things are keeping you from doing as well as you'd like with special ed students?

8. What are your greatest concerns with respect to master plan?

9. Which of these do you feel are strong points of your program?

_____ 1. More one-to-one teaching contact.

_____ 2. Serving students that wouldn't have been served before.

_____ 3. Social contact of special ed student with regular students.

_____ 4. Academic contact of special ed with other students.

_____ 5. Parental involvement.

_____ 6. Sharing of staff expertise.

_____ 7. Improvement of student self-concept.

_____ 8. Improvement of student behavior.

_____ 9. Assessing strengths and weaknesses of special ed students.

_____ 10. No labels attached to kids. Kids feel that they're no different from other kids.

_____ 11. A real difference in social flow.

_____ 12. Parent and student rights clarified.

_____ 13. Students feel less uncomfortable toward the handicapped.

_____ 14. Special ed students have a feeling that there is someone to turn to.

_____ 15. A team approach to diagnosing and solving student problems.

What are the weak points in your program?

_____ 1. Too much paperwork, meetings and phone calls for the amount of time.

_____ 2. Transient students are not in the program long enough.

_____ 3. A need for basic criteria for placement.

_____ 4. Regular class size prohibits integration.

_____ 5. Special ed classes are too large.

_____ 6. Misplaced students.

_____ 7. Attendance problems of special ed students.

_____ 8. A problem with scheduling students into regular classes.

_____ 9. More communication between special ed staff and regular teaching staff.

_____ 10. Regular teachers have an unrealistic expectation of special ed student work.

_____ 11. Help in modifying curriculum to meet special ed student's needs.

_____ 12. Aides do most of teaching because of paperwork - overdocumentation

_____ 13. Organizational problems of student schedule and work.

_____ 14. A study hall for kids with special problems (secondary).

_____ 15. Supplies and curricular materials are needed.

_____ 16. Student motivation is lacking.

_____ 17. Confusion as to which supervisor to go to principal of school or special ed administrator.

_____ 18. Not enough slots to serve all the children who should be served.

School _____ Date _____

Boy _____ Girl _____ Regular Student Questions

1. How old are you?

2. In what grade are you?

3. What subject do you like best?

4. Do you know what special education is?
(If not, give a brief explanation of special ed.)

5. Have you ever been in:

_____'s class (LDC teacher)

_____'s class (RSP teacher)

_____'s class (other special class)

or a class like these?

6. Do you have a friend who is in:

_____'s class (LDC teacher)

_____'s class (RSP teacher)

_____'s class (other special class)

7. Tell me about someone you know that receives special help.

8. How do you feel _____ is like you?

9. How do you feel _____ is different from you?

RSP _____ LDC _____ Other _____

School _____ Date _____

Boy _____ Girl _____

Special Student Questions

1. How old are you?
2. In what grade are you?
3. What subject do you like best?
4. Do you know what special education is?
   (If not, give a brief description of special ed.)

5. Have you ever been in:

   _____'s class (LDC teacher)

   _____'s class (RSP teacher)

   _____'s class (other special teacher)

6. What subjects do you have with _____(LDC teacher)?

   with _____ (RSP teacher)? with _____(regular teacher)?

7. Do you have friends in:

   _____'s class (LDC)?

   _____'s class (RSP)?

   _____'s class (other special class)?

   _____'s class (regular classroom teacher)?

   What teacher do most of your friends have?

Think of a friend in _____'s class (RSP or LDC).

8. How is _____ the same as you?

9. How is _____ different from you?

10. Do you like being in:

_____'s class (LDC)? Why?

_____'s class (RSP)? Why?

_____'s class (other special class)? Why?

_____'s class (regular classes)? Why?

Is there another class in which you'd rather be?

11. Does working in _____'s room (LDC or RSP) help you? How?